United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/902,968	07/10/2001	William G. Sample	H0001393	9229
128 HONEVWELL	7590 06/11/200 L INTERNATIONAL I	•	EXAMINER	
101 COLUMBIA ROAD	CONTEE, JOY KIMBERLY			
	P O BOX 2245 MORRISTOWN, NJ 07962-2245		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	-
		•		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		1 4 4 4 4	A ! A / - \		
Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
		09/902,968	SAMPLE, WILLIAM G.		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Joy K. Contee	2617		
Period f	The MAILING DATE of this communicator Reply	tion appears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence address		
WHI - Exte afte - If No - Fail Any	HORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAIL ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 or SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communion of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statuture to reply within the set or extended period for reply will be reply received by the Office later than three months after need patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	LING DATE OF THIS COMMUN 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a cation. ory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO by statute, cause the application to become A	ICATION. I reply be timely filed INTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed of	on <u>19 May 2006</u> .			
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL . 2b)	☑ This action is non-final.	•		
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
	closed in accordance with the practice	under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposit	tion of Claims				
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-37 is/are pending in the app 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-37 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction	withdrawn from consideration.			
Applicat	tion Papers				
9)	The specification is objected to by the E	Examiner.			
10)[The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) dojected to	by the Examiner.		
	Applicant may not request that any objection				
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the The oath or declaration is objected to be				
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority do 2. Certified copies of the priority do 3. Copies of the certified copies of application from the Internationa See the attached detailed Office action f	ocuments have been received. Incuments have been received in a street the priority documents have been the large of the la	Application No n received in this National Stage		
Attachme	nt(s) ice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 📈 Interview	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date. 5/2/6)		
2) Noti 3) Info	ice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date		o(s)/Mail Date. 5/22/0 / Informal Patent Application ——		

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35
 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this
 Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hudecek et al. (Hudecek), US Patent No. 6,289,207.

Regarding claim 1, Hudecek discloses a device, comprising: a database of radio frequency information (i.e., reads on specific frequencies stored in frequency memory) stored as a function of radio frequency (col.3,lines 31-44); and a circuit coupled to the database and operating one or more algorithms for accessing the database as a function of an input radio frequency signal and generating a display signal as a function of an input radio frequency signal (col. 3,line 45- col. 4,line 58).

Double Patenting

Page 3

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 1-37 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4 and 6-9 of copending Application No. 09/902,963. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-4 of App. No. 09/902,963 (hereafter '963) encompass the scope of the instant claims 1-37. '963 describes in independent claim 1, a database of stored radio frequency identifiers and radio frequency information corresponding thereto; and a processor coupled to the database and operating one or more algorithms for generating a display signal as a function of a correspondence between a decoded radio frequency identifier and one of the stored radio frequency

identifiers. The only difference in the present claims 1-37, is that radio frequency identifiers are not mentioned. However, a decoded radio frequency identifier are analogous to the instant application's radio frequency.

Omission of element and its function in combination is obvious expedient if remaining elements perform same function as before. <u>In re KARLSON (CCPA)</u>
136 USPQ 184 (1963).

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Henderson, US 4,212,067, discloses a navigating device.

Schwob, US 4,969,209, discloses a broadcast receiver capable of selecting stations based upon geographical location and program format.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joy K. Contee whose telephone number is 571.272.7906. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 5:30 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Appiah can be reached on 571.272.7904. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JC